



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/619,352

07/14/2003

Mark L. Buer

48974/SDB/B600

6343

23363 7590 04/17/2008  
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP  
PO BOX 7068  
PASADENA, CA 91109-7068

EXAMINER

GEE, JASON KAI YIN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2134

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/17/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/619,352	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BUER, MARK L.	
	<b>Examiner</b> JASON K. GEE	<b>Art Unit</b> 2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18, 19, 21, 22, 24-27, 29, 30, 34, 38-41 and 43-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18, 19, 21, 22, 24-27, 29, 30, 34, 38-41 and 43-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

***DETAILED ACTION***

1. This action is response to communication: amendment filed on 02/13/2008.
2. Claims 18, 19, 21, 22, 24-27, 29, 30, 34, 38-41, and 43-46 are currently pending in this application. Claims 45 and 46 have are new.
3. No new IDS has been received on this application.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 02/13/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Although the claims have been amended, the Simon reference still teaches all the limitations of the claims. New areas of the Simon reference will be used to reject the amended claims.

The applicants argue that Simon does not teach the edge routers distributing security association information to each other in Simon. However, this is taught throughout Simon, such as in paragraphs 70, where information is transmitted between edge routers. This is also discussed in paragraphs 72 and 73. The appellants also argue that this updating of security information does not happen during an active link layer connection. However, this would have been obvious, as paragraph 70 recites "this enables seamless roaming of the end node between edge routers, while enabling ESP and AU implementations to continue to function without interruption... this embodiment is also believed to be particularly advantageous in environments containing large numbers of active end nodes and/or edge routers."

***Claim Objections***

4. The previous claim objections have been withdrawn in response to applicant's amendment.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 18, 19, 25-27, 38, 39, and 45-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Simon et al. US Patent Application Publication 2003/0093691 (hereinafter Simon).

As per claim 18, Simon teaches a method of providing redundancy in a security processing system comprising: establishing a first secure packet from through a first security processor (paragraphs 50, 51, 59); updating security association information associated with the first secure packet flow (paragraphs 59, 79, 80); establishing a second secure packet flow through a second security processor (50, 51, 59, Figure 1, as these processes take place on multiple edge routers); updating security association information associated with the second secure packet flow (paragraphs 50, 51, 59, and Figure 1, as these processes take place on multiple edge routers); sending the updated

Art Unit: 2134

security association information associated with the first secure packet flow from the first security processor to the second security processor at a first predefined interval (paragraphs 60, 64, 66, 70, 74, and 82, wherein paragraphs 70 and 82 teaches that information may be distributed directly between edge routers, as it is advantageous to combine the functions of a cryptographic node with an edge router; also discussed in detail in paragraphs 72-73; ); sending the updated security association information associated with the second secure packet flow for the second security processor to the first security processor at a second predefined interval (paragraphs 60, 65, 66, 70, 74, and 82, wherein paragraphs 70 and 82 teaches that information may be distributed directly between edge routers; also, Figure 1, wherein it shows multiple edge routers, and wherein the paragraphs teach that the edge routers send each other the updated SA information; also discussed in detail in paragraphs 72 and 73); storing the updated security information associated with the first secure packet flow and the updated security association information associated with the second secure packet flow in the first security processor and in the second security processor

As per claim 19, Simon teaches wherein the rerouting step is in response to a failure of packet flow through the first security processor (abstract, paragraph 79, paragraph 95).

As per claim 25, Simon teaches generating at least one configuration packet including the security association information, wherein the sending step comprises sending the at least one configuration packet (paragraphs 54-55).

As per claim 26, Simon teaches sending, by a host processor, configuration information to the first security processor and the second security processor (paragraphs 32-37, 55, 56, 57).

As per claim 27, Simon teaches sending, by a host processor, security association configuration information to the first security processor and the second security processor (paragraphs 32-35, 37, 55, 56, 57).

Claim 38 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 18 above.

As per claim 39, Simon teaches at least one host processor connected to the at least one switch for terminating or initiating the first packet flow and the second packet flow (paragraph 43, Figure 3).

As per claim 45, Simon rerouting the secure packet flow to flow through the second security processor instead of the first (paragraphs 70, abstract, and paragraph 95)

As per claim 46, Simon teaches at least one host processor for establishing a first packet flow to a first security processor and a second packet flow to a second security processor (throughout the reference, and for example, paragraphs 70-73.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2134

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 21, 22, 24, 29-30, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simon as applied above, and in view of Xiong et al. US Patent Application Publication 2003/0061507 (hereinafter Xiong).

As per claim 21, Simon does not explicitly teach wherein the security association information comprises at least one sequence number. However, this is taught by Xiong, such as in paragraph 23.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a sequence number with a security association. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such an addition, as sequence numbers are commonly associated with security associations. This is taught in paragraph 23 of Xiong.. Also, by incorporating sequence numbers, the transmissions are more secure, as they prevent replay attacks (also found in paragraph 23).

As per claim 22, Xiong teaches wherein the security association information comprises at least one byte count (paragraph 23).

As per claim 24, Xiong teaches wherein the sending step further comprises repeatedly sending the security association information at intervals according to at least one sequence number (paragraph 23; also Simon paragraphs 57, 60, and 66; sending updates to the security association is taught throughout Simon, and it would have been obvious to combine this with the teachings of Xiong to show that it may be sent in accordance to sequence numbers).

As per claim 29, Simon teaches defining an interval at which to update the security association information in paragraphs 79-80. Xiong teaches defining a quantity to adjust a sequence number in paragraph 23. Xiong also teaches determining whether to send the security association information according to a comparison of a sequence number with the interval in paragraph 23. Although it does not teach a second processor, Simon teaches incorporating sending security associations to second security processors.

As per claim 34, Xiong teaches sending replay window information to the second security processor (paragraph 23, in combination with the Simon reference incorporating the second security processor).

9. Claims 40, 41, 43, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simon as applied above, and in view of Rosenow et al. US Patent No. 5,022,076 (hereinafter Rosenow).

As per claim 40, Simon teaches changing the routing of packet flow by either routing the first packet flow to the second security processor instead of the first security processor or routing the second packet flow to the first security processor instead of the second security processor (paragraphs 72, 73, 75, 76, and 77). However, Simon does not explicitly teach wherein the one host processor changes the routing of the packet flow. However, routing processes from one processor to another processor is well known in the art, as taught by Rosenow. Rosenow teaches throughout the reference



the routing of processes from one processor to another processor, such as in the abstract and in col. 23 lines 59 to col. 24 line 11.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the Rosenow reference with the Simon reference. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such an addition to provide more reliability by creating a fault tolerant system. This is taught throughout Rosenow, such as in the abstract and col. 4 lines 15-61.

As per claim 41, Rosenow teaches wherein the change in the routing is in response to a failure of the first packet flow through the first security processor or the second flow through the second security processor (abstract; col. 23 line 59 to col. 24 line 11). Also, this is taught in Simon's abstract, paragraph 79, and paragraph 95.

Claim 43 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 40 above.

Claim 44 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject claim 40 above. (it routes to whatever processor is working).

### ***Conclusion***

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JASON K. GEE whose telephone number is (571)272-6431. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on (571) 272-38113811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2134

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jason Gee  
Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2100  
04/14/2008

/Kambiz Zand/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2134